

House G.O.P. Leader Cautions Reagan on Rebels

By SHIRLEY CHRISTIAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 16 — The top Republican in the House of Representatives urged President Reagan today to be ready to compromise on his request for \$14 million in aid to rebels seeking the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government.

Representative Robert H. Michel of Illinois, the minority leader, gave the advice to Mr. Reagan as proponents of the aid argued on Capitol Hill that it was necessary for national security.

Mr. Michel, according to a spokesman, told the President that he needed the flexibility to accommodate demands by Democratic House leaders if an aid commitment was to be won from Congress. The spokesman said Mr. Michel did not specifically tell the President that the proposal was otherwise dead.

'A Message of Desertion'

The President, however, continued to lobby for his request, telling a group of White House visitors, "If Congress votes no, if they in essence wash their hands of our responsibility to support peaceful development and democracy in their hemisphere, they will be sending a message of desertion, a clear statement that the greatest democracy on earth doesn't care if Communism snuffs out the freedom of our neighbors and endangers our own security."

The President has asked Congress to approve the \$14 million with the provision that the aid would go for humanitarian assistance to Nicaraguan rebels if the governing Sandinistas opened negotiations with them and other opposition groups within 60 days. Otherwise, it would be used for military purposes.

Opponents in the House are believed to have enough votes to defeat the proposal when it comes up for consideration next Tuesday, and the margin is expected to be close in the Senate. However, Democrats in the House have been debating whether to offer a "Democratic alternative" to the President's plan as an expression of their own concerns about internal repression in Nicaragua and the possible threat to the region by a buildup of Soviet bloc arms there.

Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland and chairman of the Western Hemisphere subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said such a proposal, if it is to be made, would be forthcoming on Thursday. Other Congressional sources, both Republican and Democratic, indicated that the Democrats would force the issue to a straight yes-no vote next Tuesday and then decide whether alternatives are needed.

Panel Holds Hearings

The search for alternative ways to force the Sandinistas toward internal democratization and a lessened reliance on Soviet bloc military power was the theme of testimony and questions in hearings held all day by Mr. Barnes' subcommittee.

There were arguments that the aid was not justified because it would neither accomplish the overthrow of the Sandinistas nor force them to modify their policies, that it would merely justify increased repression and that it would discredit the United States.

Other arguments held that denying the aid would amount to sending a message to the Sandinistas that they now had a free hand internally, that the only way to win concessions from them was to hold a sword over their heads, and that the future of democracy in the Caribbean basin and United States national security were at risk if the aid was not approved.

"Nicaragua constitutes a security problem for the United States because it is being rapidly integrated into the Marxist-Leninist world system," said Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, former United States delegate to the United Nations and a key advocate of the Nicaraguan rebel cause. "It is not that there is a trend for Marxist-Leninist control in Nicaragua, but an established control."

How Region Views Plan

Dr. Kirkpatrick, who had just returned from a visit to rebel staging areas on the Honduran side of the border with Nicaragua, criticized internal policies of the Sandinistas, but said the reason for approving renewed aid was United States national security.

She also said that in the other countries of Central America the Reagan proposal was not seen as a United States plan but as basically a Nicaraguan opposition proposal because it incorporates a peace offer put forward March 1 by both internal and external opponents of the Sandinistas.

Stansfield Turner, director of Central Intelligence in the Carter Administration, proposed that Congress withhold the aid for now and instruct the President to reopen United States-Nicaraguan negotiations, with the understanding that Congress would approve the aid if no progress were achieved in the talks on both internal democratization and curbs on Sandinista military power.

Admiral Turner argued that approving the aid, even with the humanitarian proviso, would look to the Sandinistas like a resumption of military aid and would give them no incentive to negotiate.

"I'm not supporting the Sandinistas," Admiral Turner said when various members pressed him with their own specific criticisms of the Nicaraguan Government. "I think they are terrible, but the question is how do we get rid of them."

Impact of mobile ICBMs on stability

By Stansfield Turner

THE United States has sent a rather confused signal on arms control to the Soviet Union. Secretary of State George Shultz remarked on March 17 that two new Soviet ICBMs labeled SS-24 and SS-25 "raise considerable questions about [verification]." His reasoning was that because these missiles are mobile, verification of where they are and how many there are will be difficult. The SS-24 is to be mounted on railroad cars and the SS-25 on trucks.

What is confusing is that we have been urging the Soviets for years to rely less on large, nonmobile ICBMs and, yet, these two new mobile missiles may be a sign that they are doing just that. We have been intent on reductions in the number of their large ICBMs because such a force can be kept in readiness for a surprise attack at the push of a button; because a nonmobile missile force must be viewed as vulnerable to today's accurate weapons and there is always a risk that a vulnerable force will be launched unwisely out of concern that it would otherwise soon be destroyed; and because the large size of Soviet fixed ICBMs permits them to be loaded with up to 30 warheads, many more than ours.

The SS-24 and SS-25 do not have these three undesirable characteristics: They, being smaller missiles to make them mobile, cannot carry many warheads; they are not nearly as vulnerable as fixed ICBMs; and they are not well suited for instant, surprise attacks because they may be on the move when the button is pushed. We

should be pleased that the Soviets have recognized the virtues of mobility. As the SS-24s and SS-25s come on line, the Soviets may be more willing to negotiate reductions in their large, fixed ICBMs. Their move to these new, smaller missiles abets our long-held objectives for arms control.

Secretary Shultz is correct, though, that keeping count on mobile ICBMs is more difficult than on fixed ones. Yet, it is not impossible. The Soviets have long had the SS-20, a road mobile missile that is different from these new ones only in that it is even smaller. We have confidently counted the SS-20s. And, when President Carter proposed a scheme for deploying our new MX missile in a semi-mobile mode, we developed rules that would have made it possible for the Soviets to count the MXs. Something similar could be done for the SS-24s and SS-25s. Finally, if these Soviet missiles will cause a counting problem, so will our new Midgetman ICBM.

The Midgetman is an outgrowth of the Scowcroft Report of April 1983, which pointed out that shifting both of the superpower nuclear arsenals toward mobile ICBMs would enhance stability — that is, lessen the risk of nuclear war. Please, Mr. Shultz, let us not discourage a step to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war because it may introduce some uncertainties in counting. Preventing nuclear war, not reductions of numbers of weapons, is the objective of arms control. To have both is fine. But if there must be a choice, stability should come first.

Adm. Stansfield Turner, USN (ret.), is a former director of central intelligence.

ARTICLE APPROVED For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000600410038-9
 ON TAPE 1-B

WASHINGTON TIMES
 5 April 1985

DIANA HEARS

NETWORK FEVER ... Gary Hart *almost* hit ABC's little whoop-de-do here, celebrating Ted Koppel's five years manning "Nightline." But his office buzzed first. What about the Star Quotient? they asked. Would Joan Collins or Linda Evans be there? Well, no, said the ABCers. So Gary didn't go. But it all got quite peppy anyway. Barbara Walters flew in specially, with chum Roy Cohn. The South African Ambassador and ABCer Ken Walker — who'd been to South Africa with Ted — grinned at each other. Assorted twinklies from the Soviet Embassy swapped vibes with the two newlywed ex-CIAers, Bill Colby and Stansfield Turner. Mr. Demo, Bob Strauss, howdied with Republican honcho Frank Fahrenkopf. Boone Arledge, the ABC news Prez, and honoree Ted Koppel languished in the receiving line for two whole hours, as acolytes tripped up bearing their drinks. "Room Service!" cried David Brinkley when his turn as cupbearer came. (Or was it "Roone Service"? Everyone laughed and laughed, anyway.) "They put me next to the door in case I say something embarrassing — so I can be yanked back through it," said Ted. But of course, he didn't. He said *super* things. To Nouveau Republican Jeane Kirkpatrick: "Did they immerse you in Chablis for the

Conversion?" To someone else: "It's inevitable that anyone who squeezes bathroom tissue on television is going to become a celebrity!" As A-Listers like Cap Weinberger and John Block and Sam Pierce and Maggie Heckler trundled in, Boone waved his unlit Castro Cuba cigar. ("Peter Ueberroth got it for me while he was trying to squeeze Cuba into the Olympics," he explained.) Pollster Pat Caddell, his piebald beard all wild and whiskery, bobbed by to pay homage to the Tubers, then darted off to another party to cheer Fritz Mondale back aboard his law firm. Marvin Stone, ex-editor of US News and World Report, and Shelby Coffey, the new one, beamed at each other with wary bonhomie, like wolves who've just sorted out which one runs the pack. Arthur Miller, the legal eagle for Good Morning America, grumbled that Gossip Norma Nathan had spilled the beans on his wife suing him for divorce before he'd even gotten the papers. (That, Arthur, is what gossips are for.) And stock gadfly Evelyn Y. Davis, who owns bits of ABC, went round flashing her very fine face-lift, and darkly warning that ABC Veeps will bite the dust by the dozen now that Capital's bought them. "How do you shut this goddam party off?" Ted finally enquired. No good, Ted. It's still humming on, somewhere in Washington. Stick with Ear.